

REMARKS

Claims 18-20 were pending in the above-identified application. Claims 1-7, 11-17 and 21-22 were previously cancelled and remain cancelled and claims 8-10 and 23-45 were previously withdrawn and remain withdrawn.

In the Office Action of December 1, 2009, claims 18-20 were rejected.

With this Amendment, claim 18 is amended

I. Claim Objections

Claims 18 was objected to for various informalities.

With this amendment, claim 18 is amended taking in to consideration the Examiner's suggestions. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 103 Obviousness Rejection of Claims

Claims 18 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Roosendaal et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 6,731,360) ("*Roosendaal*") in view *Kim* (U.S. Pat. No. 6,570,634) ("*Kim*").

Claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Roosendaal et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 6,731,360) ("*Roosendaal*") in view *Kim* (U.S. Pat. No. 6,570,634) ("*Kim*") and in further view of *Kubota et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 6,771,334) ("*Kubota*") and *Kitagawa et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 6,404,469) ("*Kitagawa*").

Applicant respectfully traverses both of these rejections.

In relevant part, independent claim 18 recites a method for manufacturing a liquid crystal display including the step of forming an alignment film on a first substrate where the alignment film has an alignment direction of 45 degrees with respect to the transmission axis of the polarizer in the reflective area and an alignment direction which is parallel to the transmission axis of the polarizer in the transmissive area.

This is clearly unlike *Roosendaal* and *Kim* which both fail to disclose or even fairly suggest a method for manufacturing a liquid crystal display including the step of forming an alignment film on a first substrate where the alignment film has an alignment direction of 45 degrees with respect to the transmission axis of the polarizer in the reflective area and an alignment direction which is parallel to the transmission axis of the polarizer in the transmissive area. Instead, *Roosendaal* discloses a liquid crystal display which receive their orientation from “thin polymer alignment films” having a “planer orientation and a thickness corresponding to $d\Delta n = \lambda/4$.” See, U.S. Pat. No. 6,731,360, Col. 6, l. 4-13. *Kim* merely discloses an upper alignment layer and a lower alignment layer without disclosing any characteristics of the alignments layers. See, U.S. Pat. No. 6,570,634, Col. 7, l. 38-43. *Kubota* discloses an alignment film for a transmissive area and an alignment film for a reflective area which are configured to align the molecules in the liquid crystal layer. See, U.S. Pat. No. 6,771,334, Col. 9, l. 54-67. These cannot be fairly viewed as disclosing an alignment film in a reflective area and a transmissive area which has alignment directions related to the transmission axis of a polarizer because *Roosendaal*, *Kim* and *Kubota* fail to disclose anything pertaining to the alignment direction of the alignment films in relation to the transmission axis of a polarizer.

Kitagawa fails to disclose anything pertaining to alignment layers, much less a method for manufacturing a liquid crystal display including the step of forming an alignment film on a first substrate where the alignment film has an alignment direction of 45 degrees with respect to the transmission axis of the polarizer in the reflective area and an alignment direction which is parallel to the transmission axis of the polarizer in the transmissive area.

As the Applicants have learned, by providing an alignment film with an alignment direction of 45 degrees with respect to the transmission axis of the polarizer in the reflective area and an alignment direction which is parallel to the transmission axis of the polarizer in the

transmissive area, the dark state display in the transmissive display is improved and high contrast images can be displayed on the panel. See, U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2004/0105059, Para. [0213].

Therefore, because *Roosendaal, Kim, Kitagawa, Kubota* or any possible combination of them fails to disclose or even fairly suggest every feature of claim 18, the rejection of claim 18 cannot stand. Because claims 19 and 20 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 18, they are allowable for at least the same reasons.

III. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that all claims are clearly allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully requests early and favorable notification to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 1, 2010

By: /David R. Metzger/
David R. Metzger, Reg. No. 32,919
SONNENSCHNEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station - Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080
Phone: (312) 876-8000